



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/743,781	03/28/2001	Daniel Paris	0152.00391	7516
7590	06/01/2004			
Amy E Rinaldo Kohn & Associates 30500 Northwestern Highway Suite 410 Farmington Hills, MI 48334				
EXAMINER DELACROIX MUIRHEI, CYBILLE				
ART UNIT			PAPER NUMBER	
1614				

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/743,781

Applicant(s)

PARIS ET AL.

Examiner

Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1614

Detailed Action

The following is responsive to Applicant's amendment received Jan. 30, 2004.

Claims 4-21 are cancelled. No new claims are added. Claims 1-3 are currently pending.

Claim 2 is withdrawn from consideration.

The previous objection to the oath/declaration provided at page 2 of the office action mailed Oct. 27, 2003 **is withdrawn** in view of the supplemental oath/declaration received Jan. 30, 2004.

The previous claim rejection under 35 USC 112, paragraph 2 set forth in paragraph 1 of the office action mailed Oct. 27, 2003 **is withdrawn** in view of Applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

The previous claim rejections under 35 USC 102 set forth in paragraphs 2-3 of the office action mailed Oct. 27, 2003 **are withdrawn** in view of Applicant's amendment and the remarks contained therein.

However, Applicant's amendment necessitates the following new ground(s) of rejection.

New Ground(s) of Rejection

Claim Rejections—35 USC 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1614

1. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation "Alzheimer's disease or related disorders" introduces new matter into the claims. While there is support for "Alzheimer's disease", there does not appear to be support for the limitation "related disorders", which encompasses many types of disorders. Therefore, this limitation introduces subject matter that is broader than what was originally disclosed at the time the application was filed, and is thus new matter.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The newly added limitation "Alzheimer's diseases or **related disorders**" renders claim 1 vague and indefinite. Applicant's specification fails to define what is encompassed by "related disorders". The specification does not state the meaning that the phrase "or related disorders" is intended to have. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the claimed invention. In other words, the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired are unclear.

Art Unit: 1614

3. Claim 3 recites the limitation "the soluble A β pro-inflammatory pathway" in line 2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejection(s)—35 USC 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng et al., 6,316,464.

Cheng et al. disclose a method for treating disorders such as Alzheimer's disease by administering to a patient in need thereof an effective amount of a p38 MAP kinase inhibitor. Please see the col. 1, lines 10-15; col. 49, lines 45-55.

Claims 1 and 3 are anticipated by Cheng et al. because Cheng et al. disclose administration of an identical active agent, i.e. a p38 MAP kinase inhibitor, to a host suffering from Alzheimer's disease using Applicant's claimed method steps. Therefore, the inhibition of the phospholipase A2/arachidonic acid/5-lipoxygenase/cyclooxygenase-

Art Unit: 1614

2 pro-inflammatory pathway as well as down-regulation of the soluble A β pro-inflammatory pathway would be inherent.

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3 are rejected.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cybille Delacroix-Muirheid whose telephone number is 571-272-0572. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:30 to 6:00.

Art Unit: 1614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached at 571-272-0584. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CDM



May 26, 2004



**PHYLLIS SPIVACK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**